

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 18, and 30 have been amended herein to emphasize features of applicants' claimed subject matter. A version of all pending claims is presented on pages 2-6 of this Reply. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5-16, 18, 21, and 23-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 5-16, 18, 21, and 23-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Knutson *et al.* (US. 5,870,746). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended herein to emphasize various aspects of the claimed subject matter and Knutson *et al.* does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation set forth in such subject claims. More particularly, Knutson *et al.* fails to provide *an assessor that effectuates actions and conditions associated with the content of the folders across multiple domains via resolve or link values associated with two or more different executable applications*, as recited in independent claim 1 and 18. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 18 (and claims that depend there from) is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 3 and 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutson *et al.* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bailey ("An-Event-Condition-Action Language for XML"). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Claims 3 and 4 depend from independent claim 1; and Bailey does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Knutson *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 4 is requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 17 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 17 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutson *et al.* as applied to claims 1 and 18 above respectively, and further in view of Ku *et al.* (US 6,532,471). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Claims 17 and 29 depend from independent claims 1 and 18 respectively; and Ku *et al.* fails to makeup for the aforementioned deficiencies of Knutson *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 17 and 29 are in condition for allowance and that this rejection should be reversed.

IV. Rejection of Claims 19, 20 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 19, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutson *et al.* as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Thuraingham (US 5,481,700). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 19, 20 and 22 depend from independent claim 18, and Thuraingham does not rectify the deficiencies presented by Knutson *et al.* with respect to such claim. Accordingly, reversal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 30-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 30-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutson *et al.* (US 5,870,746), Watters (US 6,490,781), and Saxe (US 6,343,376). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Claim 30 has been amended herein to further emphasize features of applicants' claimed subject matter, and Knutson *et al.*, Watters and Saxe, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations set forth in the amended claims. In particular, the primary, secondary, and tertiary documents fail to teach or suggest: *taking action based on a conditionally valid preference that relates to two or more item domains associated with various executable applications* as recited in independent claim 30. Nowhere in the cited document are such features taught let alone suggested. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection with respect to independent claim 30, and associated dependent claims, is requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-37 be withdrawn.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP545USB].

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731